

Documento de Trabajo 2009-01
Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Empresariales
Universidad de Zaragoza

**DETECTING INTENTIONAL HERDING: WHAT LIES BENEATH INTRADAY DATA IN THE
SPANISH STOCK MARKET**

*Blasco, Natividad**

Corredor, Pilar#

*Ferreruela, Sandra**

**Department of Accounting and Finance (University of Zaragoza, Spain)*

#Department of Business Administration (Public University of Navarre, Spain)

ABSTRACT:

This paper examines the intentional herd behaviour of market participants using a new bootstrap-based approach that compares the scaled cross-sectional deviation of returns in the intraday market with the cross-sectional deviation of returns of an “artificially created” market free of intentional herding effects. The analysis is carried out for both the overall market and a sample of the most representative. The results show that the Spanish market exhibits a significant intraday herding effect that is not detected using other traditional measures when familiar stocks are analysed. Furthermore, it is suggested that herding is likely to be better revealed using intraday data.

Key words: Behaviour, finance, time series.

JELcodes: G14, G11, G12, G15

*Las autoras agradecen el apoyo financiero del Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (SEJ2006-C03-03/ECON) y del Gobierno de Aragón.

#La autora agradece el apoyo financiero del Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia y fondos FEDER(SEJ2006-14809-C03) y del Gobierno de Navarra.

* Corresponding author: Dpt. Accounting and Finance. Fac. CCEE. Gran Vía 2. 50005 Zaragoza. Spain.
E-mail: nblasco@unizar.es. Tel: +34 976 762156 / +34 976 761017. Fax: +34 976 761009

DETECTING INTENTIONAL HERDING: WHAT LIES BENEATH INTRADAY DATA IN THE SPANISH STOCK MARKET

1- INTRODUCTION

Recent research in cognitive sciences and financial economics suggests that rationality and emotion are not antithetical but are in fact complementary in decision making. This notion tempers the traditional efficient markets hypothesis that price is a sufficient statistic and no other information is needed or relevant. More precisely, behavioural finance allows some emotional responses such as fear to be compatible with the optimizing behaviour of the economic agents (Elster [1998], Lo [1999], Loewenstein [2000], Peters and Slovic [2000]. In this context, Olsen (1997) suggests that the different perceptions of risk among investors depend on how investors are able to manage individual losses, and on their ability to control and reduce the probability of losses. Investors' preference for the avoidance of loss (Kahnemann and Tversky [1979], Tversky and Kahnemann [1986]) is a key element that may imply that significant fluctuations in prices are not necessarily related to the arrival of information on economic variables, but may also correspond to collective phenomena such as crowd effects or herd behaviour (Thaler [1991], Shefrin [2000]).

Herding arises when investors decide to imitate the observed decisions of other participants in the market, who are thought to be better informed, rather than follow their own beliefs and information. In developed markets, herding is usually explained within the context of the agency theory. There seems to be a compensation-reputation scheme rewarding imitation, so that an investor's compensation depends on how his performance compares to other investors' performance and on whether deviations from the consensus are potentially costly (Scharfstein and Stein [1990], Roll [1992], Brennan [1993], Rajan [1994], Trueman [1994] or Maug and Naik [1996] among the earlier references). In fact, mimetic behaviour is not new to stock markets. Index funds, for example, blindly replicate the movements of an index of a specific financial market in order to avoid underperforming portfolios and simply assuming a tracking error (see e.g. Meade and Salkin, 1989). Likewise, differences in factors such as the relative importance of institutional versus individual investors (Lakonishok, Shleifer and Vishny

[1992], Grinblatt, Titman and Wermers [1995] and Wermers [1999]) or the level of sophistication of derivatives markets may also affect investors' decision to herd.

Nevertheless, in spite of the explanatory theoretical arguments and the opinion of market observers that herd behaviour exists, the results in the empirical literature do not lead to clear conclusions. From our viewpoint, the scarce evidence of herding found in previous studies may be explained by two key factors: the choice of sample of market participants, usually institutional investors, and the frequency of the data used in the analysis.

Most of the empirical studies focus their attention on institutional agents, due to their relative importance within the market (Nofsinger and Sias, [1999]). However, institutional investors are supposed to be better informed and more able to interpret the information available to them than other participants in the market and, consequently, they should have no clear incentive to herd intentionally. In this vein, Lakonishok et al. (1992), Grinblatt et al. (1995), Wermers (1999) or, more recently, Pirinsky (2002) and Sias (2004) do not find unanimous results. Therefore, results from institutional investors can not be easily applied in general terms to the market as a whole.

Therefore, it is appropriate to consider all market participants and to propose methodological alternatives that focus on titles rather than on investor type. Papers by Christie and Huang (1995) and Chang, Cheng and Khorana (2000) (henceforth referred to as CH and CCK, respectively) are often referenced in herding literature in connection with this idea. According to these authors, intentional herding implies a follow-the-leader relationship that might be statistically described by a lower cross-sectional deviation of returns, given that individual asset returns will not diverge substantially from the overall market return under volatile market conditions.

With respect to the frequency of data, it should be considered that a long time interval (usually quarterly in the case of institutional investors) does not permit herding to be detected if imitative behaviour occurs within much shorter periods (Radalj and McAleer [1993]). Furthermore, imitative behaviour is likely to be an intraday phenomenon. When news is released to the market at intraday levels, traders may have

no time to apply complex analytical models to interpret news and predict future price movements and therefore their decisions may not be compatible with rational thinking (Orléan [1995])), but may spontaneously follow other market participants, particularly under extreme price conditions (Henker, Henker and Mitsios [2006]). This intraday hypothesis is consistent with the theoretical models proposed by Bikhchandani et al. (1992), Banerjee (1992) and Avery and Zemsky (1998), among others.

Gleason, Mathur and Peterson (2004) and Henker et al. (2006) apply CH and CCK using intraday data, and they find no evidence in favour of the existence of herd behaviour during periods of extreme market movements. In spite of the significant usefulness of both methodologies for describing and detecting herd behaviour, an unresolved question remains: how does the cross-sectional standard deviation of returns (henceforth CSSD) behave in a market without intentional herding effects? Both CH and CCK set out results that would clearly be found in the presence of significant imitation, but we can not conclude that there is no herding effect in the absence of such results, given that we do not know how a theoretically “intentional herding-clean” market would function.

Intentional herd behaviour is a relative concept which may be difficult to test. Financial markets tend to function with moderate “intrinsic” herding levels. According to Prechter (2001), Forgas (1995) or Lowenstein et al. (2001), unconscious impulses to avoid losses spur herding behaviour, making rational independence extremely difficult to exercise in group settings and producing collective agreement in thought and action. These primitive impulses are not irrational if they have a purpose in a utility-maximising sense when knowledge is lacking or logic irrelevant, or if individuals merely have a certain level of intrinsic preference for conformity (Grinblatt and Keloharju [2000]). Nevertheless, we should differentiate them from intentional herding. Intentional dependence upon the behaviour of others is a rational decision when other participants are thought to be better informed, even at times when information is scarce, or when a strong market agreement is suspected. Rational pricing models are usually based on strict hypotheses of rational expectations that do not fully consider the evolution of financial markets, the possibility of contagion among markets or assets or,

as mentioned, emotional responses or psychological factors characterizing market reality that may be complementary with rationality in decision making.

In this paper we propose an alternative less stringent approach for shedding light on these questions. The aim is to present a methodological approach, initially based on the measure proposed by CH and on a later adaptation by Blasco and Ferreruela (2008), to detect one aspect that, to our knowledge, has not been studied sufficiently, namely intentional herding in the intraday market. We apply this methodological proposal to the Spanish market in order to corroborate the results presented in Blasco and Ferreruela (2007) using alternative analytical tools. Our purpose is also thought-provoking and stimulating interest on a topic with noticeable potential value in the financial literature. The controversy about the meaning of herding and the difficulty in identifying or designing appropriate analytical tools should encourage researchers to overcome these problems.

The intuition underlying our approach permits a comparison of herding levels in relative terms. A stock market is said to intentionally herd if we can find significant differences in the level of mimetic behaviour when compared with others that are assumed not to exhibit any significant herding effect (or at least no significant intentional herding effects), although they may exhibit other practical imperfections. Hence, we start by following the procedure set out in Blasco and Ferreruela (2007) to create a comparable market situation artificially created and reasonably identified as clean of intentional herding effects. This paper presents what we think to be some important novelties. First, we propose a significance test based on bootstrap methods. Second, we apply this new empirical tool to the Spanish stock market using intraday data, our aim being to provide evidence of the usefulness of high frequency data for studying imitative behaviour. And third, we attempt to corroborate the results of previous studies on the intraday Spanish market that suggest that imitative behaviour mainly affects heavily traded stocks.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we describe the methodology and data. In section 3, we provide a discussion of the empirical results and, finally, in section 4 we summarize our findings.

2- METHODOLOGY AND DATA DESCRIPTION

According to CH, in the presence of intentional herd behaviour individuals are more likely to suppress their own beliefs in favour of the market consensus and, therefore, the returns on individual stocks cluster more tightly around the total market return. CH suggest that this phenomenon is particularly intense during periods of substantial volatility when markets are less discriminating of individual stocks and treat all stocks similarly. Nevertheless, investors may adopt strategies that imitate the general market movement at any given time when other participants are thought to be better informed, even at times when information is scarce.

Following the idea presented in CH, we propose to exploit the information held in the cross-sectional movements of the market (CSSD) to detect herd behaviour with intraday data. In the presence of the herd effect, the cross-sectional dispersion at any given time should become smaller than when there is no herding, and prices may not correspond to their fundamental value during short time periods. The CSSD measure is defined in CH as

$$CSSD_t = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (R_{it} - R_{mt})^2}{n-1}} \quad [1]$$

where R_{it} is the observed stock return on firm i at time t and R_{mt} is the aggregate market portfolio return at time t . What is relevant for our purpose is to determine the distribution of CSSD in the absence of intentional herd behaviour. That is, we should bring our “intentional herding-free” index as close as possible to the traditional definition of market efficiency and, therefore, we should construct it with a number of individual assets that basically respond to their own information and whose trading is mainly justified by their own attributes. This “herding-clean” distribution will be the reference in order to test the relevance of mimetic actions in any other market at any time.

Orléan (1995), in a framework inspired by the Ising model¹, suggests that a market in which agents do not interact with each other would tend to give rise to a Gaussian distribution for market fluctuations when the imitation is weak. We use Orléan's suggestions in order to construct our "intentional herding-free" index but allowing some intrinsic tendency towards conformity and mimetic behaviour as well as other responses or psychological factors characterizing market reality. A stock market is said to intentionally herd if we can find significant differences in the level of mimetic behaviour when compared with others that are assumed not to exhibit any significant herding effect or, at least, not significant intentional herding effects, although they may exhibit other practical imperfections (e.g. spurious autocorrelation or other noisy statistical inferences that could be present in any stock market, even in an "intentional herding-free" market) .

To proceed with the CSSD replication, we initially take the methodological approach suggested in Blasco and Ferreruela (2008). The procedure may be summed up as follows: we first generate a fictitious equally-weighted stock index as the average of 28 real (and very diverse) international stock indexes (henceforth NMIt). Correlations are generally lower between international than domestic markets which implies, by construction, the lowest likely intentional herding levels. Second, we select the ten least correlated international indexes (LCI_j with $j=1\dots 10$) and identify them with non-intentionally imitative individual behaviour, that is, individual financial assets whose evolution depends very significantly on the information available in its own domestic market. This proposal pretends to minimize the outcomes of imitative collective behaviour following the findings in Schneidman, Berry, Segev and Bialek (2006). Third, we calculate the empirical CSSD distribution of these ten indexes with respect to the fictitious equally-weighted stock index and thus determine a proxy distribution for CSSD in the absence of intentional imitating behaviour. More precisely, we calculate the empirical time series of CSSD in the absence of herding (CSSDNH) as follows:

¹ This proposal has been used to model diverse phenomena in which bits of information, interacting in pairs, produce collective effects. Although this model is usually acknowledged to usefully explain statistical mechanics, Schneidman, Berry, Segev and Bialek (2006) show that the Ising model is useful for any model of neural function. They find that collective behaviour is described quantitatively by models that capture the observed pairwise correlations and predict that larger networks are completely dominated by correlation effects

$$CSSD_{NIt} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n (RLCI_{jt} - RNMI_t)^2}{n-1}} \quad [2]$$

where $RLCI_{jt}$ is the observed stock return on LCI_j at time t with $j=1 \dots 10$, and $RNMI_t$ is the aggregate return in the notional stock market at time t .

The results and conclusions of a number of papers such as Sornette and Johansen [1997], King and Wadhwani [1990], King, Sentana and Wadhwani [1994], Groenen and Franses (2000) or Heaney, Hooper and Jagietis (2000) support the use of real international market data rather than artificially generated time series to provide a better basis for the analysis of intrinsic herding. By averaging international indexes as if they were individual assets, we can re-create a market by statistical analogy free of intentional herding but exhibiting an intrinsic tendency to herd in which there are groups of assets sharing more characteristics than others. At this point we use daily averaged returns of the above-mentioned 28 international stock indexes over the period January 1998-April 2004.

This methodological approach first presented in Blasco and Ferreruela (2008) starts from the advantageous availability of daily data belonging to very different international stock markets. Nevertheless, its replica with intraday data becomes extremely difficult due to the scarce availability of high frequency data in so many diverse international markets. Hence, we must propose some practical changes for applying the suggested procedure to an intraday database. In order to provide a more homogeneous comparison avoiding proportional differences among daily and intraday differences in cross-sectional deviations and returns, we first scale cross-sectional deviations with their corresponding aggregated return. This is the first modification of the initial approach in Blasco and Ferreruela (2008).

² As mentioned before, under the assumption of, at most, weak imitation, the return time series of the notional index should behave as a Gaussian distribution. The value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test (Chakravarti, Laha, and Roy, 1967) is 0.0327 with a p-value of 10.88%, indicating that we can not strongly reject the normality of the return distribution.

Then, we compare the scaled CSSD distribution of the market under study (CSSDS) with that computed in the absence of intentional herding effect (CSSDSNH). In the presence of intentional herd behaviour (where individuals ignore their own beliefs and base their investment decisions on the aggregate behaviour of the market), individual returns will not deviate significantly from the overall market return and, therefore, this behaviour will lead to a scaled CSSD distribution highly concentrated around zero, which implies a scaled CSSD distribution with a significant kurtosis compared to the scaled CSSD distribution of a market free of intentional herding behaviour.

The last step involves carrying out a significance test in order to assess the observed discrepancy, if any, between the CSSDS distribution of the Spanish market and the CSSDSNH distribution, the latter corresponding to the null hypothesis of no intentional herding effect. In this case, the distribution of the computed differences between both probability distributions is not properly supported by a well-known theoretical formula that permits an accurate assessment of their significance. In order to address this weakness, we propose a bootstrap method. This is the second significant change with respect to the initial proposal in Blasco and Ferreruela (2008). Re-sampling methods are not new to significance testing (see, among others, Lei and Smith [2003], Chou [2004] or Güttler [2004]). The bootstrap-based procedure applied in this paper is very simple, although computer-intensive. According to the nature of significance tests, in order to calculate the significance of the differences in probability under the null hypothesis, we must re-sample with replacement from CSSDSNH the same number of observations as in our raw data set. We construct 5000 bootstrapped data sets to guarantee the accuracy of the analysis.

If we denote $FCSSDbootiSNH$ with $i=1,\dots,5000$, the bootstrapped data set i from CSSDSNH, the differences in the probability of landing in the same interval between the CSSDSNH distribution ($FCSSDSNH$) corresponding to the null hypothesis and every bootstrapped distribution and between $FCSSDSNH$ and the raw distribution are computed for 102 intervals in which we divide the whole range of scaled CSSD values. For each interval $j=1\dots 102$, with lower and upper limits lj and $lj+1$, respectively, the differences in the probability can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(l_j \leq x < l_{j+1} | FCSSD_{SNH}) - \Pr(l_j \leq x < l_{j+1} | FCSSD_{SNH}^{boot}) &= Dj_{NH}^{boot} \\ \Pr(l_j \leq x < l_{j+1} | FCSSD_{SNH}) - \Pr(l_j \leq x < l_{j+1} | FCSSD_{raw}) &= Dj_{raw} \end{aligned} \quad [3]$$

for $i=1, \dots, 5000$, and $l_1=-50$, $l_{102}=50$, with $FCSSDraw$ being the raw distribution of the scaled CSSD ($CSSD_s$). The computed differences Dj_{NH}^{boot} with $i=1, \dots, 5000$ are used to generate the bootstrap p-values for interval j as

$$p_j^{boot} = \Pr(Dj_{NH}^{boot} \geq Dj_{raw}) \quad \text{when } Dj_{raw} > 0$$

or

[4]

$$p_j^{boot} = \Pr(Dj_{HF}^{boot} \leq Dj_{raw}) \quad \text{when } Dj_{raw} < 0$$

The above equations calculate the p-value for finding the same (or higher in absolute value) bootstrapped differences in probability compared to the difference between the scaled CSSD distribution corresponding to the null hypothesis and the raw distribution without implying the true presence of an intentional herding effect.

Our empirical test focuses on intraday data, the raw database consisting of information about all intraday trades carried out from January 1996 to December 2003. For each trade in a trading session we know the exact time (hour, minutes and seconds) in which the transaction takes place, the stock denomination, the transaction price, the number of titles being traded, as well as the broker codes corresponding to the stock buyer and seller.

In order to properly apply our test, we have eliminated from the database those trades occurring before and after the open and close of formal trading sessions. In spite of this elimination, the number of transactions during an ordinary session fluctuates between approximately 20,000 and 100,000, implying highly complex computational treatment if all data and all trading sessions are analytically involved. The number of transactions progressively increases over time, particularly from 1999 onwards, due to the longer trading time in a daily session and to the number of brokers participating in the market. For this reason, following the suggestions in Patterson and Sharma (2006) we have selected 100 trading sessions randomly but taking into account every month

over the eight years considered in the complete database. To compute the series of CSSD, we determine half-hour time intervals within each trading session, usually between nine o'clock in the morning and half past five in the afternoon.

At this point it should not be difficult to accept that stock assessment depends on individual perceptions. Shefrin and Statman (1999) or Ganzach (2000) offer results indicating that analysts evaluate stocks not only discounting the proper information but also in terms of global attitudes toward them. Among other factors, familiarity is shown to affect preference in the financial analysis. Furthermore, for familiar assets, participants directly access relevant information and, from our viewpoint, whenever they decide to imitate each other, the intentionality may be stronger. For this reason, it seems to be important to consider familiarity of financial assets in analysing issues such as herd behaviour and we repeat the analysis carried out for the overall market using only the 10% most heavily traded stocks.

Additionally, and in order to provide evidence about the particular usefulness of intraday data for studying herding effects, we repeat the analysis using daily data of the 10% most heavily traded stocks. In this case, although the time interval is the same that we use with intraday data (January 1996 to December 2003), we have not selected a random sub-sample and all daily returns are considered in the analysis.

3- RESULTS

Table 1 Panel A shows some averaged descriptive statistics about trading activity in the Spanish stock market calculated from the 100 days taken as a database in the first analysis of this paper. It should be pointed out that trading volume increased significantly (about 900%) during the period under study. The trading volume (both in titles and in euros) of some noticeable stocks such as Telefónica, BSCH (or its previous constituents Banco Santander and Central Hispano), BBVA (or its previous constituents BBV and Argentaria), Repsol, Endesa and Iberdrola is remarkably high.

Table 1 Panel A. Averaged descriptive statistics of the overall sample.

Averaged daily trading volume (in euros)	1.102.659.483
Averaged daily trading volume (in euros) for one title	3.291.521
Averaged daily trading volume (in titles)	89.925.689
Averaged daily trading volume (in titles) for one title	268.435
Averaged daily number of transactions	42.869
Averaged daily number of transactions for one title	124
Averaged daily trading volume (in titles) in one transaction	2.098
Averaged daily trading volume (in euros) in one transaction	25.722
Averaged daily trading volume (in euros)	1.102.659.483

Table 1 Panel B reports statistics of the CSSD series for the overall market with intraday data and for the most traded stocks both with intraday and daily data, as well as for the market free of herding effects. The results indicate that the dispersion measure is lower when calculated with intraday data. The mean values of the CSSD series corresponding to our Spanish raw data are, in all cases, lower than those corresponding to the market clean of herding. These summary statistics invite a deeper analysis of the imitative behaviour.

Table 1 Panel B. Descriptive statistics of the daily and intraday CSSD

	<i>Overall intraday sample</i>	<i>Heavily traded stocks. Intraday data.</i>	<i>Herding-free market</i>	<i>Heavily traded stocks. Daily data.</i>
Mean	1,436	0,006	3,333	2,655
Std. Deviation	96,470	0,128	119,842	114,612
Max.	2153,591	3,296	1900,526	4596,433
Min.	-1129,293	-0,557	-2456,440	-1059,505

As another starting point before implementing the methodological proposal, Table 2 gives the results of the traditional CH test using intraday and daily data. CH use one or five percent of the observations in the upper and lower tail of the market return distribution to define extreme price movement days. As an intermediate alternative, we propose 3% of the observations in the upper and lower tail. This table includes both the results for the overall market and for the sample of stocks with high trading volume. In both cases (intraday and daily data) the coefficients of the dummy variables DL and DU are positive and significant at the 1% significance level, indicating that dispersion increases under extreme market price conditions and therefore suggesting no evidence of intraday herding effect in the Spanish market either in the overall market or in the

selected heavily traded stocks. These results agree with the theoretical arguments exposed in CH related to rational asset pricing models. These models predict that large changes in the market return would lead to an increase in dispersion because individual assets differ in their sensitivity to the market return. Nevertheless, the estimated values of β_L and β_U provide additional information if considered individually. For the overall market, these coefficients are not remarkably different. However, the coefficients estimated from the sub-samples of heavily traded stocks indicate that the dispersion increases more rapidly with extreme downward price changes than with upward movements. This finding agrees with the suggestion in Henker et al. (2006) questioning the assertion of Chang et al. (2000) that there is an increased likelihood that herding will occur during periods of down-market stress.

Table 2. CH Regression results of the intraday and daily CSSD.

<i>Overall market. Intraday data</i>		<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>t-Statistic</i>	<i>P-value</i>
	Intercept	0,00761345	2,74840052	0,00606666
	Variable D_t^L	0,12842556	8,13068343	9,4057E-16
	Variable D_t^U	0,11485873	8,07997141	1,4006E-15
<i>Selected heavily traded stocks. Intraday data.</i>		<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>t-Statistic</i>	<i>P-value</i>
	Intercept	1,581E-05	0,0081625	0,9934885
	Variable D_t^L	0,09233908	9,24331095	8,786E-20
	Variable D_t^U	0,03124289	3,1574038	0,0016263
<i>Selected heavily traded stocks. Daily data.</i>		<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>t-Statistic</i>	<i>P-value</i>
	Intercept	0,0197931	22,3117338	3,2097E-97
	Variable D_t^L	0,12739446	25,4310679	1,268E-121
	Variable D_t^U	0,02269866	4,73313447	2,3891E-06

Reports the estimated coefficients of the following regression model: $CSSD_t = \alpha + \beta^L D_t^L + \beta^U D_t^U + \varepsilon_t$

$D_t^L=1$, if the market return on day t lies in the extreme *lower* tail of the distribution; and equal to zero otherwise, and

$D_t^U=1$, if the market return on day t lies in the extreme *upper* tail of the distribution; and equal to zero otherwise

The percentage of observations in the upper and lower tails of the market return distribution used to define price movements is the 3%.

As far as we know, there are not many papers offering results for the purposes of comparison. Gleason et al. (2004) apply CH and CCK using intraday data for sector Exchange Traded Funds traded on the American Stock Exchange and Henker et al. (2006) apply the same methodology to Australian stocks. As in our case, their results

support the conclusion that investors do not herd during periods of extreme market movements.

Tables 3 and 4 include the results of our methodological proposal and Figure 1 illustrates these results. The presence of herd behaviour in the Spanish market would be identified with a high probability of finding small values of its scaled CSSD statistics, indicating reduced dispersion values around the aggregated return when compared to FCSSDSNH. As can be seen in Table 3, when the overall sample is considered, the differences in probability when the distributions of scaled CSSD values are compared (FCSSDSNH - FCSSDraw) indicate that our raw sample is more likely to determine larger dispersion values than a free of intentional herding market, given that such differences are basically negative except in central values around zero. However, when heavily traded stocks are selected, scaled CSSD values significantly concentrate around zero, more precisely within the interval $(-1, 1]$, suggesting that those financial assets tend to move co-ordinately even though they respond to different individual information and belong to different activity sectors.

These results are consistent, on the one hand, with the findings documented by Blasco et al. (2005). In the Spanish market, stocks tend to react more quickly and strongly to macroeconomic or general information (especially bad news) rather than to firm-specific information. This indicates that prices may respond to factors and effects other than particular items of information. When firm-specific news is released, investors may not be sure of what to expect and may need additional time to analyse the information flow in order to make appropriate inferences. They consequently take short-term decisions following other market participants, favouring the market consensus. The significant levels of intentional herding behaviour could be due to the way in which Spanish investment professionals rely heavily on reasoning by analogy, so that their decision procedures may become more intuitive as complexity increases. They are "satisfiers", not optimizers. Their primary aim is to make an acceptable choice.

Table 3. Differences in probability and their significance. Overall sample. Intraday data.

<i>Interval limits</i>	<i>Differences in probability</i>	<i>Signif. level</i>	<i>Interval limits</i>	<i>Differences in probability</i>	<i>Signif. level</i>	<i>Interval limits</i>	<i>Differences in probability</i>	<i>Signif. level</i>
-50	-0,973%	0,620%	-16	-0,355%	0,744%	18	-0,433%	0%
-49	-0,072%	0%	-15	-0,577%	0%	19	-0,288%	0,248%
-48	-0,072%	0%	-14	-0,576%	0%	20	-0,286%	0,248%
-47	-0,145%	0%	-13	-0,275%	NS	21	-0,503%	0%
-46	-0,145%	0%	-12	-0,349%	4,963%	22	-0,138%	NS
-45	0,000%	NS	-11	-0,640%	0%	23	-0,215%	0,372%
-44	-0,071%	NS	-10	-0,860%	0%	24	-0,145%	0%
-43	0,074%	NS	-9	-0,851%	0%	25	0,076%	NS
-42	-0,071%	NS	-8	-1,356%	0%	26	-0,362%	0%
-41	-0,217%	0%	-7	-0,987%	0,124%	27	-0,215%	0,496%
-40	-0,072%	0%	-6	-1,920%	0%	28	-0,217%	0%
-39	-0,069%	NS	-5	-1,843%	0%	29	-0,217%	0%
-38	-0,072%	0%	-4	-0,290%	NS	30	-0,072%	0%
-37	-0,072%	0%	-3	-0,840%	NS	31	-0,072%	0%
-36	0,002%	NS	-2	3,132%	0%	32	-0,069%	NS
-35	-0,145%	0%	-1	11,969%	0%	33	0,000%	NS
-34	-0,217%	0%	0	2,912%	0%	34	-0,072%	0%
-33	0,002%	NS	1	4,811%	0%	35	-0,072%	0%
-32	-0,362%	0%	2	13,810%	0%	36	-0,145%	0%
-31	-0,072%	0%	3	2,211%	0,124%	37	-0,072%	0%
-30	-0,071%	NS	4	0,128%	NS	38	0,000%	NS
-29	-0,072%	0%	5	-1,734%	0%	39	0,074%	NS
-28	-0,072%	0%	6	-2,711%	0%	40	-0,143%	1,737%
-27	0,003%	NS	7	-1,396%	0%	41	0,000%	NS
-26	-0,286%	0,744%	8	-1,780%	0%	42	-0,072%	0%
-25	-0,215%	0,372%	9	-1,425%	0%	43	0,000%	NS
-24	-0,579%	0%	10	-1,356%	0%	44	0,076%	NS
-23	0,003%	NS	11	-1,868%	0%	45	-0,071%	NS
-22	-0,503%	0%	12	-0,645%	0%	46	-0,072%	0%
-21	-0,285%	0,868%	13	-1,219%	0%	47	0,000%	NS
-20	-0,140%	NS	14	-0,498%	0%	48	-0,145%	0%
-19	-0,431%	0%	15	-1,011%	0%	49	0,000%	NS
-18	-0,724%	0%	16	-0,574%	0%	50	0,074%	NS
-17	-0,505%	0%	17	-0,209%	NS	And thereafter	-0,383%	NS

The differences in probability (Probability in intentional herding-free distribution - Probability in raw distribution) for each of the 102 intervals for the scaled CSSD values are computed as well as the bootstrapped significance level for positive and negative differences. NS denotes not significant.


Furthermore, these results also agree with those documented in Blasco and Ferreruella (2008), where a proposed daily CSSD measure is notably lower in the Spanish market over the whole market return range when some familiar stocks are analyzed in the international context, and with those documented in Blasco and Ferreruella (2007), where

Table 4. Differences in probability and their significance. Heavily traded stocks sample. Intraday data.

<i>Interval limits</i>	<i>Differences in probability</i>	<i>Signif. level</i>	<i>Interval limits</i>	<i>Differences in probability</i>	<i>Signif. level</i>	<i>Interval limits</i>	<i>Differences in probability</i>	<i>Signif. level</i>
-50	1,849%	0%	-16	0,296%	1,613%	18	0,074%	NS
-49	0,000%	NS	-15	0,074%	NS	19	0,074%	NS
-48	0,000%	NS	-14	0,148%	NS	20	0,148%	NS
-47	0,000%	NS	-13	0,666%	0%	21	0,148%	NS
-46	0,000%	NS	-12	0,592%	0%	22	0,296%	1,365%
-45	0,000%	NS	-11	0,518%	0,124%	23	0,074%	NS
-44	0,074%	NS	-10	0,370%	0,124%	24	0,000%	NS
-43	0,074%	NS	-9	0,814%	0%	25	0,148%	NS
-42	0,074%	NS	-8	0,815%	0%	26	0,000%	NS
-41	0,000%	NS	-7	1,183%	0%	27	0,074%	NS
-40	0,000%	NS	-6	1,553%	0%	28	0,000%	NS
-39	0,148%	NS	-5	1,775%	0%	29	0,000%	NS
-38	0,000%	NS	-4	3,328%	0%	30	0,000%	NS
-37	0,000%	NS	-3	4,587%	0%	31	0,000%	NS
-36	0,074%	NS	-2	7,546%	0%	32	0,148%	NS
-35	0,000%	NS	-1	14,719%	0%	33	0,000%	NS
-34	0,000%	NS	0	-43,788%	0%	34	0,000%	NS
-33	0,074%	NS	1	-46,606%	0%	35	0,000%	NS
-32	0,000%	NS	2	16,053%	0%	36	0,000%	NS
-31	0,000%	NS	3	8,506%	0%	37	0,000%	NS
-30	0,074%	NS	4	5,845%	0%	38	0,000%	NS
-29	0,000%	NS	5	3,476%	0%	39	0,074%	NS
-28	0,000%	NS	6	1,775%	0%	40	0,074%	NS
-27	0,148%	NS	7	2,367%	0%	41	0,000%	NS
-26	0,075%	NS	8	1,331%	0%	42	0,000%	NS
-25	0,074%	NS	9	1,036%	0%	43	0,000%	NS
-24	0,000%	NS	10	0,888%	0%	44	0,148%	NS
-23	0,148%	NS	11	0,592%	0%	45	0,074%	NS
-22	0,148%	NS	12	0,296%	1,241%	46	0,000%	NS
-21	0,222%	NS	13	0,518%	0%	47	0,000%	NS
-20	0,222%	NS	14	0,370%	0,248%	48	0,000%	NS
-19	0,148%	NS	15	0,074%	NS	49	0,000%	NS
-18	0,000%	NS	16	0,222%	NS	50	0,074%	NS
And								
-17	0,074%	NS	17	0,370%	0,868%	thereafter	2,367%	0%

The differences in probability (Probability in intentional herding-free distribution - Probability in raw distribution) for each of the 102 intervals for the scaled CSSD values are computed as well as the bootstrapped significance level for positive and negative differences. NS denotes not significant.

imitative behaviour is found in the intraday dynamic of the Spanish market using some alternative methodologies as those proposed in Patterson and Sharma (2006). In this sense, we think our work contributes to the empirical literature since it proposes a methodological alternative that seems to be more powerful than the measure first presented in CH and that corroborates the results offered by other different analytical tools.


Figure1. Probability distributions of standardized CSSD

Finally, Table 5 and Figure 2 show the results using daily data for heavily traded stocks. Our findings confirm the results provided by intraday data and suggest the robustness of the methodology when applied to different data frequency. There are significant negative differences in probability in central values around zero, indicating the noticeable weight of reduced dispersion values around the aggregated return in the Spanish market when compared to FCSSDSNH. Scaled daily CSSD values significantly concentrate around zero, once again within the interval $(-1, 1]$, suggesting that the selected financial assets tend to move co-ordinately. Nevertheless, the differences in probability, although significant, are not so great as in the case of intraday data. We interpret these estimations as evidence in favour of high frequency data in order to better reveal the existence of herding effects.

Table 5. Differences in probability and their significance. Heavily traded stocks sample. Daily data.

<i>Interval limits</i>	<i>Differences in probability</i>	<i>Signif. level</i>	<i>Interval limits</i>	<i>Differences in probability</i>	<i>Signif. level</i>	<i>Interval limits</i>	<i>Differences in probability</i>	<i>Signif. level</i>
-50	0,934%	0,12%	-16	0,181%	NS	18	-0,040%	NS
-49	0,000%	NS	-15	-0,098%	NS	19	-0,212%	2,48%
-48	-0,057%	0,00%	-14	0,034%	NS	20	-0,024%	NS
-47	-0,114%	0,00%	-13	0,265%	NS	21	0,034%	NS
-46	-0,057%	0,00%	-12	0,248%	NS	22	0,181%	NS
-45	0,000%	NS	-11	0,175%	NS	23	-0,040%	NS
-44	0,017%	NS	-10	-0,031%	NS	24	-0,172%	0,00%
-43	0,017%	NS	-9	0,184%	NS	25	0,034%	NS
-42	0,074%	NS	-8	0,029%	NS	26	-0,114%	0,00%
-41	-0,057%	0,00%	-7	-0,247%	NS	27	0,074%	NS
-40	-0,114%	0,00%	-6	-0,163%	NS	28	0,000%	NS
-39	0,034%	NS	-5	0,231%	NS	29	0,000%	NS
-38	-0,229%	0,00%	-4	-0,104%	NS	30	-0,057%	0,00%
-37	0,000%	NS	-3	-0,375%	NS	31	-0,172%	0,00%
-36	0,017%	NS	-2	0,696%	NS	32	0,034%	NS
-35	-0,057%	0,00%	-1	0,875%	NS	33	-0,114%	0,00%
-34	-0,114%	0,00%	0	-3,181%	0,00%	34	0,000%	NS
-33	0,074%	NS	1	-1,909%	0,00%	35	-0,057%	0,00%
-32	0,000%	NS	2	-0,392%	NS	36	-0,057%	0,00%
-31	-0,057%	0,00%	3	0,440%	NS	37	-0,057%	0,00%
-30	0,074%	NS	4	1,054%	4,84%	38	0,000%	NS
-29	-0,114%	0,00%	5	0,616%	NS	39	-0,040%	NS
-28	-0,057%	0,00%	6	-0,056%	NS	40	0,074%	NS
-27	0,091%	NS	7	0,593%	NS	41	0,000%	NS
-26	0,148%	NS	8	0,073%	NS	42	0,000%	NS
-25	0,017%	NS	9	0,177%	NS	43	-0,057%	0,00%
-24	-0,114%	0,00%	10	0,144%	NS	44	0,148%	NS
-23	0,034%	NS	11	0,191%	NS	45	0,017%	NS
-22	0,091%	NS	12	-0,162%	NS	46	0,000%	NS
-21	0,107%	NS	13	0,175%	NS	47	-0,114%	0,00%
-20	0,107%	NS	14	-0,145%	NS	48	0,000%	NS
-19	-0,024%	NS	15	-0,441%	0,00%	49	-0,057%	0,00%
-18	-0,458%	0,00%	16	0,050%	NS	50	0,074%	NS
-17	0,017%	NS	17	0,084%	NS	And thereafter	1,280%	0,00%

The differences in probability (Probability in intentional herding-free distribution - Probability in raw distribution) for each of the 102 intervals for the scaled CSSD values are computed as well as the bootstrapped significance level for positive and negative differences. NS denotes not significant.

Figure 2. Probability distributions of standardized CSSD. Heavily traded stocks with daily data included.

4- CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we present an empirical test for detecting intentional herding, even to a moderate degree, using a variant of the methodology first presented by Christie and Huang (1995) that may be usefully applied to intraday data. Our empirical proposal consists of a comparison of scaled cross-sectional standard deviation measures in a particular market with those calculated in an artificially created market which is assumed to be free of intentional imitative behaviour. The significance test is carried out by bootstrap methods that have been shown to be useful and robust in significance testing.

We apply this methodological procedure to a database covering a wide time horizon (1997-2003) that permits general results to be obtained independently of specific market situations. We propose two different comparative analyses: first, the application both to the overall market and to a selection of large trading volume stocks

and second, the application to heavily traded stocks using both intraday and daily data, our purpose being to obtain additional information on the herding effect characteristics.

Heavily traded stocks are useful in the analysis given that if investors can easily access relevant information about these titles, their decision to herd is consistent with an intentional preference for following the decision of other participants. Our results lead to the general conclusion that the Spanish market, particularly in heavily traded stocks, exhibits a tendency towards imitation.

To sum up, in addition to the robustness of the methodology, our results show the key importance of heavily traded stocks for studying mimetic behaviour as well as the key importance of intraday data. The use of overall market data and lower frequency data may obscure the existence of intentional herding if imitative attitudes take place only on a sub-sample of titles or over a shorter time interval.

REFERENCES

- Avery, C., Zemsky, P. (1998). Multidimensional Uncertainty and Herd Behavior in Financial Markets, *American Economic Review*, 88, 724-748.
- Banerjee, A. (1992). A Simple Model of Herd Behavior, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107, 797-818.
- Bikhchandani, S., Hirshleifer, D., Welch, I. (1992). A Theory of Fads, Fashion, Custom, and Cultural Change as Informational Cascades, *Journal of Political Economy*, 100, 992-1026.
- Blasco, N., Corredor, P., del Río, C., Santamaría, R. (2005). Bad news and Dow Jones make the Spanish stocks go round, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 163/1, 253- 275.
- Blasco, N., Ferreruela, S. (2007). Comportamiento Imitador en el Mercado Bursátil Español: Evidencia Intradía, *Revista de Economía Financiera*, 13, 56-75.
- Blasco, N., Ferreruela, S. (2008). Testing intentional herding in familiar stocks: an experiment in an international context, *The Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 9/2, 72-84.
- Brennan, M. (1993). Agency and asset prices, Finance Working Paper No. 6-93, UCLA.
- Chakravarti, I.M., Laha, R.G., Roy, J. (1967). *Handbook of Methods of Applied Statistics*, Volume I, John Wiley and Sons, pp. 392-394.
- Chang, E.C., Cheng, J.W., Khorana, A. (2000). An examination of herd behavior in equity markets: An international perspective, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 24, 1651-1679.
- Chou, P.H. (2004). Bootstrap Tests for Multivariate Event Studies, *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, 23/3, 275–290.
- Christie, W.G., Huang, R.D. (1995). Following the pied piper: Do individual returns herd around the market? *Financial Analysts Journal*, July-August, 31-37.
- Elster, J. (1998). Emotions and economic theory, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36, 47-74.
- Forgas, J.P. (1995). Mood and judgment: The affect infusion model (AIM), *Psychological Bulletin*, 117/1, 39-66.
- Ganzach, Y. (2000). Judging risk and return of financial assets, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 83, 353-370
- Gleason, K.C., Mathur, I., Peterson, M.A. (2004). Analysis of Intraday Herding Behavior Among the Sector ETFs, *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 11, 681-94.

- Grinblatt, M., Keloharju, M. (2000). The investment behavior and performance of various investor types: a study of Finland's unique data set, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 55, 43-67
- Grinblatt, M., Titman, S., Wermers, R. (1995). Momentum investment strategies, portfolio performance and herding: A study of mutual fund behaviour, *American Economic Review*, 85, 1088-1105.
- Groenen, P.J.F., Franses, P.H. (2000). Visualizing Time-varying Correlations across Stock markets, *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 7, 155-172.
- Güttler, A. (2004). Using a Bootstrap Approach to Rate the Raters. EFMA 2004 Basel Meetings Paper.
- Heaney, R., Hooper, V., Jagietis, M. (2000). Regional Integration of National Stock Markets, *Asian Review of Accounting*, 8, 55-65.
- Henker, J., Henker, T., Mitsios, A. (2006). Do Investors Herd Intraday in Australian Equities?, *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, 2/3, 196.
- Kahnemann, D., Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory; an analysis of decisions under risk, *Econometrica*, 47, 262–291.
- King, M.A., Sentana, E., Wadhwani, S. (1994). Volatility and links between national stock markets, *Econometrica*, 62/4, 901-933.
- King, M.A., Wadhwani, S. (1990). Transmission of Volatility between Stock Markets, *Review of Financial Studies*, 3, 5-33.
- Lakonishok, J., Shleifer, A., Vishny, R.W. (1992). The impact of institutional trading on stock prices, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 32, 23-43.
- Lei, S., Smith, M.R. (2003). Evaluation of Several Nonparametric Bootstrap Methods to Estimate Confidence Intervals for Software Metrics, *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 29/11, 996 - 1004.
- Lo, A. (1999). The three P's of total risk management, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 55, 12-20.
- Loewenstein, G. (2000). Emotions in economic theory and economic behaviour, *American Economic Review*, 90, 426-432.
- Loewenstein, G.F., Weber, E.U., Hsee, C.K., Welch, N. (2001). Risk as feelings, *Psychological Bulletin*, 127/2, 267-286.
- Maug, E., Naik, N. (1996). Herding and delegated portfolio management, mimeo, London Business School.
- Meade, N., Salkin, G.R. (1989). Index Funds—Construction and Performance Measurement, *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 40, 871–879

- Nofsinger, J. R., Sias, R.W. (1999). Herding and Feedback Trading by Institutional Investors, *Journal of Finance*, 54, 2263-2316.
- Olsen, R.A. (1997). Investment risk: the experts' perspectives, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 53, 62-66.
- Orléan, A. (1995), Bayesian interactions and collective dynamics of opinion: Herd behavior and mimetic contagion, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 28, 257-274.
- Patterson, D. M., Sharma, V. (2006). Do Traders Follow Each Other at the NYSE?, Working Paper, SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=712401>
- Peters, E., Slovic, P. (2000). The springs of action: Affective and analytical information processing in choice, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 1465-1475.
- Pirinsky, C. (2002). Herding and Contrarian Trading of Institutional Investors, Working Paper, Texas A&M University.
- Prechter, R. (2001). Unconscious Herding Behavior as the Psychological Basis of Financial Market Trends and Patterns, *The Journal of Psychology and Financial Markets*, 2/3, 120–125
- Radalj, M., McAleer, M. (1993). Herding, Information Cascades and Volatility Spillovers in Futures Markets. Honours Thesis, University of Western Australia, May.
- Rajan, R.G. (1994). Why credit policies fluctuate: A theory and some evidence, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 436, 399-442.
- Roll, R. (1992). A mean/variance analysis of tracking error, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, summer, 13-22.
- Scharfstein, D.S., Stein, J.C. (1990). Herd behavior and investment, *American Economic Review*, 80, 465-479.
- Schneidman, E., Berry, M.J., Segev, R., Bialek, W. (2006). Weak pairwise correlations imply strongly correlated network states in a neural population, *Nature*, 440, 1007–1012.
- Shefrin, H. (2000). *Beyond greed and fear; Understanding behavioral finance and the psychology of investing* Cambridge: HBS Press.
- Shefrin, H., Statman, M. (1999). Comparing expectations about stock returns to realized returns, Working Paper, Santa Clara University.
- Sias, R.W., (2004). Institutional Herding. *Review of Financial Studies*, 17/1, 165-206.
- Sornette, D., Johansen, A. (1997). Large financial crashes, *PHYSICA A*, 245, 411-422.
- Thaler, R. (1991). *Quasi-rational economics*, New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Trueman, B. (1994). Analyst Forecasts and herding behaviour, *Review of Financial Studies*, 7, 97-124.

Tversky, A., Kahnemann, D. (1986). Rational choice and the framing of decisions, *Journal of Business*, 59, 251–278.

Wermers, R. (1999). Mutual fund herding and the impact on stock prices, *Journal of Finance*, 54, 581-622.

<p style="text-align: center;">DOCUMENTOS DE TRABAJO Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Empresariales Universidad de Zaragoza</p>

2002-01: “Evolution of Spanish Urban Structure During the Twentieth Century”. Luis Lanaspá, Fernando Pueyo y Fernando Sanz. Department of Economic Analysis, University of Zaragoza.

2002-02: “Una Nueva Perspectiva en la Medición del Capital Humano”. Gregorio Giménez y Blanca Simón. Departamento de Estructura, Historia Económica y Economía Pública, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2002-03: “A Practical Evaluation of Employee Productivity Using a Professional Data Base”. Raquel Ortega. Department of Business, University of Zaragoza.

2002-04: “La Información Financiera de las Entidades No Lucrativas: Una Perspectiva Internacional”. Isabel Brusca y Caridad Martí. Departamento de Contabilidad y Finanzas, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2003-01: “Las Opciones Reales y su Influencia en la Valoración de Empresas”. Manuel Espitia y Gema Pastor. Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2003-02: “The Valuation of Earnings Components by the Capital Markets. An International Comparison”. Susana Callao, Beatriz Cuellar, José Ignacio Jarne and José Antonio Laínez. Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Zaragoza.

2003-03: “Selection of the Informative Base in ARMA-GARCH Models”. Laura Muñoz, Pilar Olave and Manuel Salvador. Department of Statistics Methods, University of Zaragoza.

2003-04: “Structural Change and Productive Blocks in the Spanish Economy: An Input-Output Analysis for 1980-1994”. Julio Sánchez Chóliz and Rosa Duarte. Department of Economic Analysis, University of Zaragoza.

2003-05: “Automatic Monitoring and Intervention in Linear Gaussian State-Space Models: A Bayesian Approach”. Manuel Salvador and Pilar Gargallo. Department of Statistics Methods, University of Zaragoza.

2003-06: “An Application of the Data Envelopment Analysis Methodology in the Performance Assessment of the Zaragoza University Departments”. Emilio Martín. Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Zaragoza.

2003-07: “Harmonisation at the European Union: a difficult but needed task”. Ana Yetano Sánchez. Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Zaragoza.

2003-08: “The investment activity of spanish firms with tangible and intangible assets”. Manuel Espitia and Gema Pastor. Department of Business, University of Zaragoza.

2004-01: “Persistencia en la performance de los fondos de inversión españoles de renta variable nacional (1994-2002)”. Luis Ferruz y María S. Vargas. Departamento de Contabilidad y Finanzas, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2004-02: “Calidad institucional y factores político-culturales: un panorama internacional por niveles de renta”. José Aixalá, Gema Fabro y Blanca Simón. Departamento de Estructura, Historia Económica y Economía Pública, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2004-03: “La utilización de las nuevas tecnologías en la contratación pública”. José M^a Gimeno Feliú. Departamento de Derecho Público, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2004-04: “Valoración económica y financiera de los trasvases previstos en el Plan Hidrológico Nacional español”. Pedro Arrojo Agudo. Departamento de Análisis Económico, Universidad de Zaragoza. Laura Sánchez Gallardo. Fundación Nueva Cultura del Agua.

2004-05: “Impacto de las tecnologías de la información en la productividad de las empresas españolas”. Carmen Galve Gorriz y Ana Gargallo Castel. Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2004-06: “National and International Income Dispersion and Aggregate Expenditures”. Carmen Fillat. Department of Applied Economics and Economic History, University of Zaragoza. Joseph Francois. Tinbergen Institute Rotterdam and Center for Economic Policy Research-CEPR.

2004-07: “Targeted Advertising with Vertically Differentiated Products”. Lola Esteban and José M. Hernández. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2004-08: “Returns to education and to experience within the EU: are there differences between wage earners and the self-employed?”. Inmaculada García Mainar. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza. Víctor M. Montuenga Gómez. Department of Business. University of La Rioja

2005-01: “E-government and the transformation of public administrations in EU countries: Beyond NPM or just a second wave of reforms?”. Lourdes Torres, Vicente Pina and Sonia Royo. Department of Accounting and Finance. University of Zaragoza

2005-02: “Externalidades tecnológicas internacionales y productividad de la manufactura: un análisis sectorial”. Carmen López Pueyo, Jaime Sanau y Sara Barcenilla. Departamento de Economía Aplicada. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2005-03: “Detecting Determinism Using Recurrence Quantification Analysis: Three Test Procedures”. María Teresa Aparicio, Eduardo Fernández Pozo and Dulce Saura. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2005-04: “Evaluating Organizational Design Through Efficiency Values: An Application To The Spanish First Division Soccer Teams”. Manuel Espitia Escuer and Lucía Isabel García Cebrián. Department of Business. University of Zaragoza.

2005-05: “From Locational Fundamentals to Increasing Returns: The Spatial Concentration of Population in Spain, 1787-2000”. María Isabel Ayuda. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza. Fernando Collantes and Vicente Pinilla. Department of Applied Economics and Economic History. University of Zaragoza.

2005-06: “Model selection strategies in a spatial context”. Jesús Mur and Ana Angulo. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2005-07: “Conciertos educativos y selección académica y social del alumnado”. María Jesús Mancebón Torrubia. Departamento de Estructura e Historia Económica y Economía Pública.

Universidad de Zaragoza. Domingo Pérez Ximénez de Embún. Departamento de Análisis Económico. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2005-08: “Product differentiation in a mixed duopoly”. Agustín Gil. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2005-09: “Migration dynamics, growth and convergence”. Gemma Larramona and Marcos Sanso. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2005-10: “Endogenous longevity, biological deterioration and economic growth”. Marcos Sanso and Rosa María Aísa. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2006-01: “Good or bad? - The influence of FDI on output growth. An industry-level analysis“. Carmen Fillat Castejón. Department of Applied Economics and Economic History. University of Zaragoza. Julia Woerz. The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies and Tinbergen Institute, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

2006-02: “Performance and capital structure of privatized firms in the European Union”. Patricia Bachiller y M^a José Arcas. Departamento de Contabilidad y Finanzas. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2006-03: “Factors explaining the rating of Microfinance Institutions”. Begoña Gutiérrez Nieto and Carlos Serrano Cinca. Department of Accounting and Finance. University of Saragossa, Spain.

2006-04: “Libertad económica y convergencia en argentina: 1875-2000”. Isabel Sanz Villarroja. Departamento de Estructura, Historia Económica y Economía Pública. Universidad de Zaragoza. Leandro Prados de la Escosura. Departamento de H^a e Instituciones Ec. Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.

2006-05: “How Satisfied are Spouses with their Leisure Time? Evidence from Europe*”. Inmaculada García, José Alberto Molina y María Navarro. University of Zaragoza.

2006-06: “Una estimación macroeconómica de los determinantes salariales en España (1980-2000)”. José Aixalá Pastó y Carmen Pelet Redón. Departamento de Estructura, Historia Económica y Economía Pública. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2006-07: “Causes of World Trade Growth in Agricultural and Food Products, 1951 – 2000”. Raúl Serrano and Vicente Pinilla. Department of Applied Economics and Economic History, University of Zaragoza, Gran Via 4, 50005 Zaragoza (Spain).

2006-08: “Prioritisation of patients on waiting lists: a community workshop approach”. Angelina Lázaro Alquézar. Facultad de Derecho, Facultad de Económicas. University of Zaragoza. Zaragoza, Spain. Begoña Álvarez-Farizo. C.I.T.A.- Unidad de Economía. Zaragoza, Spain

2007-01: “Determinantes del comportamiento variado del consumidor en el escenario de Compra”. Carmén Berné Manero y Noemí Martínez Caraballo. Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2007-02: “Alternative measures for trade restrictiveness. A gravity approach”. Carmen Fillat & Eva Pardos. University of Zaragoza.

2007-03: “Entrepreneurship, Management Services and Economic Growth”. Vicente Salas Fumás & J. Javier Sánchez Asín. Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas. University of Zaragoza.

2007-04: “Equality versus Equity based pay systems and their effects on rational altruism motivation in teams: Wicked masked altruism”. Javier García Bernal & Marisa Ramírez Alerón. University of Zaragoza.

2007-05: “Macroeconomic outcomes and the relative position of Argentina’s Economy: 1875-2000”. Isabel Sanz Villarroya. University of Zaragoza.

2008-01: “Vertical product differentiation with subcontracting”. Joaquín Andaluz Funcia. University of Zaragoza.

2008-02: “The motherwood wage penalty in a mediterranean country: The case of Spain”. Jose Alberto Molina Chueca & Victor Manuel Montuenga Gómez. University of Zaragoza.

2008-03: “Factors influencing e-disclosure in local public administrations”. Carlos Serrano Cinca, Mar Rueda Tomás & Pilar Portillo Tarragona. Departamento de Contabilidad y Finanzas. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2008-04: “La evaluación de la producción científica: hacia un factor de impacto neutral”. José María Gómez-Sancho y María Jesús Mancebón-Torrubia. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2008-05: “The single monetary policy and domestic macro-fundamentals: Evidence from Spain”. Michael G. Arghyrou, Cardiff Business School and Maria Dolores Gadea, University of Zaragoza.

2008-06: “Trade through fdi: investing in services”. Carmen Fillat-Castejón, University of Zaragoza, Spain; Joseph F. Francois. University of Linz, Austria; and CEPR, London & Julia Woerz, The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies, Austria.

2008-07: “Teoría de crecimiento semi-endógeno vs Teoría de crecimiento completamente endógeno: una valoración sectorial”. Sara Barcenilla Visús, Carmen López Pueyo, Jaime Sanaú. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2008-08: “Beating fiscal dominance. The case of Spain, 1874-1998”. M. D. Gadea, M. Sabaté & R. Escario. University of Zaragoza.

2009-01: “Detecting Intentional Herding: What lies beneath intraday data in the Spanish stock market”. Blasco, Natividad, Ferreruela, Sandra (Department of Accounting and Finance. University of Zaragoza. Spain); Corredor, Pilar (Department of Business Administration. Public University of Navarre, Spain).